

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-4149**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOY FIRST,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 14-4150**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PHILLIP RUNKEL,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 14-4161**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MALACHY KILBRIDE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 14-4165**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JANICE SEVRE'-DUSZYNSKA,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 14-4168**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MAX OBUSZEWSKI,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:13-cr-00444-TSE-1; 1:13-cr-00446-TSE-IDD-1; 1:13-cr-00425-TSE-IDD-1; 1:13-cr-00447-TSE-IDD-1; 1:13-cr-00445-TSE-1)

---

Submitted: July 15, 2014

Decided: July 30, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joy First; Phillip Runkel; Malachy Kilbride; Janice Sevre'-  
Duszynska; Max Obuszewski, Appellants Pro Se. Stacy M. Chaffin,  
Special Assistant United States Attorney, Rosanne Cannon Haney,  
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

After a bench trial before a magistrate judge, Joy First, Phillip Runkel, Malachy Kilbride, Janice Sevre'-Duszynska and Max Obuszewski were convicted of trespassing in violation of 32 C.F.R. § 1903.7(a) (2014). The district court affirmed their convictions. On appeal, the Appellants challenge the sufficiency of the evidence as well certain evidentiary decisions made by the magistrate judge.

On appeal from a district court order affirming a magistrate judge's decision, we use the same standard used by the district court: whether the magistrate judge's findings when viewed in a light most favorable to the Government were clearly erroneous. United States v. Hughes, 542 F.2d 246, 248 (5th Cir. 1976). We have reviewed the evidence, including the various arguments put forth by the Appellants that their conduct was not illegal, and conclude that there is sufficient evidence to support the convictions.

We have also reviewed the evidentiary decisions made by the magistrate judge and conclude that there was no abuse of discretion. United States v. Cole, 631 F.3d 146, 153 (4th Cir. 2011).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED